DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 685 FL 020 804

AUTHOR Novak, Ben
TITLE Covert, Undetected, and Uncorrected: Apparently Fossilized Structures in the English Interlanguage of a Native Speaker of German.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 15p.; In: Young, Richard, Ed. Southern Illinois Working Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching, Volume 1; see FL 020 801.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *English (Second Language); *Error Analysis (Language); *German; *Interlanguage; Second Language Learning
IDENTIFIERS *Fossilized Language

ABSTRACT

It is asserted that the optimum method of describing the stages of an interlanguage (IL) and the development of learner competency toward the target language (TL) is one of self-analysis and subsequent reanalysis. A nine-page letter written by a native speaker of German in 1987 is compared with her correction of the letter in 1991. Analyses indicate that, while some stabilized idiosyncrasies originate in interlingual identifications, and some corrections are toward target language norms, others do not correspond to any forms outside the IL. The latter seem to be improvements on the TL and are examined in detail, especially restrictive relative clause structures. That none of the idiosyncrasies greatly affect the perceived interpretability of the IL by native speakers would inhibit their identification as errors by the subject, thereby encouraging stabilization. These findings imply that IL development involves some degree of internal analysis independent of external linguistic stimuli, lending credence to the treatment of interlanguages as independent of both the native and the TL. There also seems to be a threshold that must be reached before idiosyncrasies are perceived as errors to be reanalyzed and corrected. (Author/JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED358685

Covert, Undetected, and Uncorrected: Apparently Fossilized Structures in the English Interlanguage of a Native Speaker of German

Ben Novak

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dr Richard Young
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The goal of this paper is to identify apparently fossilized idiosyncrasies in the English interlanguage (IL) of a native speaker of German, ascertain their origins, and find possible reasons for their stabilization. This requires maximally accurate interpretations of the speaker's intended meanings, and clear understanding of the IL structures through which those meanings are conveyed. The method of obtaining this knowledge of the IL involves a two part analysis. The data consists of a nine page letter written by H in 1987, and her correction of the letter in 1991. These two sets of data were compared with regard to what was (not) corrected and why, and what H's intentions were. These analyses indicate that, while some stabilized idiosyncrasies originate in interlingual identifications, and some corrections are toward target language norms, others do not correspond to any forms outside the IL. The latter, which seem to be improvements on the target language, are the focus of this paper, with emphasis on restrictive relative clause structures. The fact that none of the idiosyncrasies greatly affect the perceived interpretability of the IL by native speakers would inhibit their identification as errors by H, thereby encouraging stabilization. These findings imply that IL development involves some degree of internal analysis independent of external linguistic stimuli, lending credence to the treatment of interlanguages as independent of both the native and the target language. There also seems to be a threshold which must be reached before idiosyncrasies are perceived as errors to be reanalyzed and corrected.

FL020804

Introduction: Definition of the Problem and a Possible Solution

According to Corder (1981), there is a need for "longitudinal studies of learners expressed in terms of sequential sets of their 'états de dialecte'" (p. 34). He proposes that "a description of the learner's 'état de dialecte' can be better achieved by a recognition that what he speaks is not an inadequate or incorrect form of the target language but a peculiar transitional idiolect, which should be approached in the same way as that of an infant or some unknown language" (p. 34).

He further states that "the well-formedness or otherwise of a learner's utterance is not the only criterion for establishing the presence of errors, but ... what is crucial is whether the normal target language interpretation of his utterance is appropriate

in the context" (p. 44). If we have access to the learner, the optimum method of ascertaining the intended meaning of a statement is to "ask him to say what he intended to say in his mother tongue and then translate into the target language" (p. 37). This is called an authoritative interpretation. The problem with authoritative interpretations is "deciding whether he produced the acceptable form by *chance* or by *design*. Only thorough familiarity with his knowledge of the language will enable us to decide" (p. 42).

With all of this in mind, it seems that the truly optimum method of describing the stages of an interlanguage (IL) and the development of learner competency toward the target language (TL) is one of self analysis and subsequent reanalysis. If we have the learner analyze his own data in IL1 from some previous time, and correct his own perceived errors to conform with his present IL2, we would simultaneously have textual data for longitudinal sets of IL stages, and intuitional data in the form of (self) grammaticality judgments. If we then mutually (on the part of the learner and the linguist) reanalyze both sets of data in conjunction with translations into the mother tongue (where deemed necessary), we would have not only authoritative reconstructions of learner intentions, but knowledge of whether acceptable forms have been produced by chance or design. We would also gain a fairly clear picture of learner competence, and an insight into the process of learning and the perception of what has been learned. The following paper is a small-scale attempt at carrying out such a self analysis and mutual reanalysis.

Methodology

The subject, who will be referred to as H, is a native German who has spoken English as a second language for over 25 years. H initially learned English in a classroom situation, and spoke English only in the classroom until 1985. From 1985 until October 1990 she spoke English in about half of her conversations at home and at work. Since October 1990, she has lived in America and essentially speaks English all the time. I would characterize her reading, writing and speaking skills as advanced/fluent.

The IL1 data is a letter written to me in 1987, in English, while the subject was on vacation. She was asked, in July 1990, to "correct any mistakes in her English" in this letter, and basically rewrite it in her present level of English. This is the IL2 data. Both were written without the aid of a dictionary or a native speaker.

The subject and I then compared the first two pages of IL1 and IL2 sentence by sentence, with regard to what was altered, why it was altered, and what the original intention of the sentence was. This provided the basis for my choice of what features of her IL to examine in this paper. Optimally, we would have gone through every page of both sets of data, but due to time constraints and the necessarily narrow scope of a short research paper, this was not attempted.

Reanalysis of the first two pages of IL1 and IL2 revealed a number of interesting (and many not so interesting) idiosyncrasies—or errors—in H's English. I would like to highlight some of the more interesting and consistent ones before moving on to my main focus.

Highlights of the Analysis

Lexicon

Most of the vocabulary errors appearing in the data are apparent fossilizations (see Selinker and Lakshmanan, in press) probably originating in interlingual identifications (see Weinreich, 1953, and Selinker, 1991). For instance, she uses the word *souper* throughout the data for the TL *supper*. This comes from the German cognate *Souper*, which is translated as *dinner* in English. A similar example is her spelling of the TL word *hundred* as *hundret* in the data, an obvious cognate to the German *hundert*, and probably the result of interlingual identification. Her spelling of *alcoholic* as *alkoholic* also comes from the German *alkoholisch*.

German/English cognates are a problem in her speech as well. *Sensible* is used for TL *sensitive* as a result of the German cognate *sensibel*. The word *psychology* (German *Psychologie*) has become almost unpronouncable in her English and her German. Her IL pronunciation varies somewhere in between [sai'kaledzi] and [psixolo'gi] (approximating standard English and Hochdeutsch pronunciations respectively). This variation occurs in her NL German as well, an example of backwash interference.

Syntax

A relatively minor, and by no means consistent, error that appears in both IL1 and IL2 has to do with adverbs and word order. Adverbs and adverbial phrases in German generally either introduce the sentence or follow the inflected verb they modify, and series of adverbs follow the sequence time-manner-place. H often follows these rules in her IL1 and IL2 data, which, while not affecting the comprehensibility of her utterances, does cause them to sound non-native, as in:

(1)

IL1 Back to Palma (the capital city) we went by train, made in 1912 by Siemens.

IL2 Back to Palma, the capital city, we got by a train made in 1912 by Siemens.

TL We went back to Palma, the capital city, on a train which was made in 1912 by Siemens.

(2)

IL1 So I will wear the rest of the week my 2 sweatshirts and the jeans.

IL2 I will have to wear the two sweatshirts and the one pair of

jeans for the rest of the week.
TL I'll have to wear the two sweatshirts and the one pair of jeans for the rest of the week.

(3)
IL1 - they start to dance downstairs ...
IL2 - they start to dance now downstairs ...
TL - they're starting to dance downstairs now ...

As stated above, these IL structures do not affect comprehensibility and are highly variable. Her IL1 sentence (2) may indicate that in 1987 H's IL did not include the English strict adjacency requirement, which prevents adverbs from appearing between verbs and their objects. Her IL2 correction specifically, and the variability of her word order in general with regard to adverbs, may indicate that she has recognized the strict adjacency requirement and is in the process of reanalyzing this feature of her IL.

Semantics

Some of the more interesting errors in H's English are so covert that they do not seem to be errors at all in the traditional sense, but they directly affect comprehensibility, and deserve mention. For instance, the phrase, *german made coffee* in the IL2 sentence *Ugly hotel next to ugly hotel, lots of hamburger stands, german made coffee, german Weizenbier a.s.o.*, would be understood by a native English speaker to mean German coffee, and even the translation into the mother tongue is *Deutscher Kaffee*. However, in the subject's IL, *German Coffee* would indicate the coffee beans, their origin, and/or the way the coffee is brewed, while *german made coffee* refers specifically to the way the coffee is brewed; in the German manner as opposed to the Turkish manner, etc. She is making a distinction in her English which is lost on the native listener. This is a failure in communication, and therefore an error.

She makes a related covert error in her use of the verb *do*. The functions of the verb *do* in the TL include its use as a main verb, an auxiliary verb, and as the dummy *do* used in negation and yes/no question formation. H uses *do* as a sort of modal carrying a sense of intensification of the verb, in addition to the regular TL functions of *do*.

While it is true that in English *do* can carry a sense of emphasis (in anticipation of opposition), H distinguishes between emphatic and intensive *do* through the use of word stress in her speech (italics mark emphatic stress):

I love you. - statement
I *do* love you. - emphatic
I do love you. - intensive
I don't love you. - negation

I do *not* love you. - emphatic negation
I do not love you. - intensive negation
I *don't* love you. - emphatic negation

Just as emphatics could be made more clear by introducing the sentence with *but*, the intensives could be made more clear by using the adverb *really*. I can find no parallel feature in German, so the likely origin of the intensive is intralingual identification with the emphatic. In any case, the two functions are distinct in H's IL. The intensive *do* definitely appears twice in IL1 and IL2, and is actually corrected to *really* once in IL2:

(4)

IL1	I bought me Bitter, a non-allkoholic drink I do like.
IL2	I bought Bitter, a non alkoholic drink I really like.
TL	I bought Bitter, a nonalcoholic drink I really like.

(5)

IL1	And I do get a big cold.
IL2	And I do get a big cold.
TL	And I'm catching a really big cold.

It is difficult to find other examples of this distinction in the data, since H was taught in school not to use contractions in writing, and since the English writing system does not usually reflect word stress. Even in speech, *I do love you* would be understood by the native speaker as a simple statement, and the intended distinction would be lost, once again causing failure in communicating intended meaning. Such an error would be difficult to detect, let alone correct, and the intensive *do* may permanently remain a feature of her IL as an apparent fossilization.

Main Focus: Relatives and the Sin of Omission

Another sort of covert, undetected, and uncorrected error occurs in her IL1 and IL2. This type of error is an omission which causes, if any, only minor detectable (overt) errors. My main focus in this paper is restrictive relative clauses introduced by overt relative markers, of which there is an almost total absence in the data. I am assuming that restrictive relative clauses modify some NP (hereafter referred to as the antecedent), and can be overtly introduced by relative pronouns such as *who* and *which*, or complementizers such as *that* (hereafter referred to collectively as the relative markers).

Out of approximately165 IL1 and approximately 161 IL2 sentences, there is only one restrictive relative clause introduced by a relative marker in IL1, and only two in the IL2 correction. The italicized strings of words are coindexed with their antecedent.

(6)
IL1 They also have *Bingo-Nights* here—*you love so.*
IL2 You know they have *bingo-nights* here too, *the one you love so mutch.*

(7)
IL1 It's a typical *place* (*I do absolut not like*) for tourist.
IL2 This is a typical touristy *place, the one I absoloutly do not like.*

(8)
IL1 He is between 60 and 70 years old and here to watch the *national race. That means hundret thousand people are jogging together.*
IL2 He is probably between 60-70 years old and he is here to watch the *'National Race'. Which is an event where thousands of people meet just to jog together.*

(9)
IL1 It amused me, nothing good beside a German *girl who danced the flamenco very well.*
IL2 It was very amusing. Nothing good besides a german *girl who danced the flamenco very well.*

None of these four sentences poses a great problem as far as interpretation of intended meaning is concerned, but only (9) is clear as to what sort of sentence structure was intended, and only (9) looks like a near-native sentence. It was only after careful inquiry that I was able to establish that (6), (7), and (8) contain relative clauses. I was able to establish that (8) and (9) contain relative pronouns, but the status of *the one* in (6) and (7) remained unclear. The relative markers *who*, *that*, and *which* in (8) and (9) are representative of the TL group of relative markers, but they are the only examples in the data. Without relative markers in the data, it was difficult to ascertain which, if any, of her other sentences contained relative clauses.

There are two likely reasons for so few relative markers (and so few relative clauses) appearing in her IL1 and IL2: (a) she is unable to form relative clauses, and (6)–(9) were produced by chance; (b) she is avoiding relative markers and/or relative clauses; or (c) both. The fact that she actually produced four relative clauses in the data, and produces relative clauses in her speech, all of which she produces by design, would rule out the former explanation. This leaves us with some variant on the avoidance theme as the probable analysis.

There were a number of constructions in her IL1 data which looked suspiciously similar to the IL1 constructions in (6)–(9), which actually were, or became, relative clauses in the IL2 constructions there. Also, in going through

the data with her, I found many constructions in both IL1 and IL2 which would correspond in meaning and intent to TL relative clauses. Of those, the following is a list of the sentences in which I was able to establish with any certainty that the suspected relative clauses were present and produced by design. The italicized strings of words are coindexed with their antecedents:

(10)
IL1 Have had already my first *day*. *It was not so bad.*
IL2 Have had already my first *day* and *it was not so bad at all.*

(11)
IL1 The place I am is called *St. Ponso* and *it is at the sea.*
IL2 The place here is called *St. Ponso, it is at the sea.*

(12)
IL1 When you go away from the crowded *places* at the coast *tourist prefer*, the Island is realy pretty.
IL2 When you stay away from the crowded *touristy places* the island is really pretty.

(13)
IL1 Back to Palma (the capital city) we went by *train, made in 1912 by Siemens.*
IL2 Back to Palma, the capital city, we got by a *train made in 1912 by Siemens.*

(14)
IL1 Now, I have an international fanclub an *english—shy*, an *french—charming*, a group of austrians an *swiss—loud* and not to forget the spanish—never, but unfortunately no arabian.
IL2 I have now an international fanclub; one *shy english*, a *charming frenchman*, a whole group of austrians, a *loud swiss*, these unnessessary spanish machos, but unfortunately no arabian.

(15)
IL1 I'm a really *woman—always freezing.*
IL2 I am a real *woman—I am always cold.*

(16)
IL1 I bought me Bitter, a non-alkoholic *drink I do like.*
IL2 I bought Bitter, a nonalkoholic *drink I really like.*

(17)
IL1 Probably it was the last *Brandy in bed.*
IL2 It was probably the last *brandy I had in bed.*

(18)
IL1 Because I still have no opener at the room I drank a *Brandy* (*I bought for home*) at bed and smoked a last cigarette.
IL2 Because I still have no opener at the room, I drank a *Brandy* (*I bought for home*) in bed and smoked a last cigarette.

(19)
IL1 But I have some *surprices* for you and Dingsda, *you will like it.*
IL2 But I have some *surprices* for you and Dingsda, *you will like it.*

We must ascertain exactly what H is avoiding before we can describe how and why she is avoiding it. In light of (10) through (19), it does not seem as though she is avoiding the relative clause construction in general (though this seems to be a tendency), since there are relative clauses conforming to the TL structure in (12), (16), (17), and (18). They lack only the relative marker, which is optional in these cases. In fact, none of the sentences in (10) through (19) contain a relative marker, which probably means that what she is specifically avoiding is relative markers.

If we assume that she is avoiding relative markers, there must be a finite number of substrategies used to attain this avoidance. She seems to have two main strategies:

R Varying stages of REDUCTION of the relative clause:
R-1 Dropping of the relative marker wherever optional
R-2 Dropping of the verb and formation of a postnominal modifier
R-3 Full reduction of the relative clause into an adjective

A ATTACHMENT of an independent clause after the main clause, with a pronoun (usually *it*) acting in place of an unmoved relative marker and modifying to a NP in the main clause.

In IL1, all strategies except *R-3* are represented: Attachment appears in (10), (11), and (19); *R-1* appears in (12), (16), and (18); and *R-2* appears in (13), (14), (15), and (17). The absence of strategy *R-3* in IL1 data does not necessarily mean that H was not using this particular strategy in 1987. She has informed me that she was not aware of the adjective *touristy* at that time. This would, of course, have prevented her from fully reducing the relative clause in (12). Any number of adjectives in the data could therefore be suspected of being fully reduced relative

clauses, but this would be pointless to pursue. In IL2, the strategies are distributed about evenly: Attachment appears in (10), (11), (15), and (19); *R-1* appears in (16), (17), and (18); *R-2* appears in (13); and *R-3* appears in (12) and (14).

Her corrections from IL1 to IL2 show a marked pattern of ordered preferences. Wherever a reduction strategy occurs in IL1, there is equal or greater reduction of the relative clause in IL2. There is one definite exception in (17), where strategy *R-2* is corrected to *R-1*. Her explanation is that *in bed* sounds odd to her when modifying *Brandy*, possibly indicating that the IL1 sentence was a mistake. There is another possible exception in (15), where *R-2* is corrected into *A* as the only case of strategy overlap. Her stated original intent was the sense *I am a typical female who is always freezing*. If we assume that her order of strategy preference begins with avoiding the marker of a relative clause, then the strategy overlap in (15) may imply that attachment is a sort of last resort strategy, which is used whenever a relative marker would be otherwise unavoidable.

Whenever the attachment strategy occurs in IL1 it also occurs in IL2, with no case of strategy overlap to the reduction strategy. There is a parallel to the reduction strategy in the preference for corrections: the attached clause is always equally or more closely attached to the main clause in IL2. A separate sentence gets attached by an *and* in (10), an *and* becomes a comma in (11), and (19) retains the same punctuation.

One salient characteristic common to the sentences containing an attached clauses in IL2 is that none of the attached clauses is reducible, and all of them would be obligatory contexts for a relative marker in the TL. This lends support to my conclusion that the attachment strategy is used as last resort in avoidance of relative markers.

Her strategy of avoidance could thus be summed up as: If the relative marker is optional, delete it. If the clause is reducible, reduce it as far as possible. This takes care of most of the relative clauses, and does so in a manner which conforms to TL standards. There is therefore no detectable or correctable error at this point. Those few relative clauses left untouched by this are formed as attached independent clauses. It is at this point that she departs from TL norms, and it is here that the error becomes overt, but still poses no problem in communication, except in (19), where it would be unclear to the native speaker whether the attached clause refers to the fact that H has surprises, or to the surprises themselves. This is a rather minor failure in communication of intended meaning.

Distribution of Markers in Relative Clauses

The question to be asked now is what (if any) are the relative markers in her IL2 repertoire. When I asked her which pronoun she would use in (10) through (19), if she had to use one of the choices *who*, *which*, or *that*, I got some interesting results.

Which is grammatical in (10), (11), (12), (13), (16), (17), (18), and (19), and conveys the intended meaning of her IL2 sentences. It is always optional, and she prefers to delete it or go back to IL2 structures. Except for the apparently obligatory deletion, *which* functions as it does in the TL.

Who is grammatical in (14), and (15), conveys the intended meaning of these IL2 sentences, and also seems to function as it does in the TL.

That is grammatical wherever *which* is grammatical but always changes the meaning of the sentence by not modifying any NP antecedent at all. *That* functions as a complementizer introducing a sentential complement. While *that* is also a complementizer in the TL, the fact that it is not treated as a relative marker in IL2 is a definite deviation from TL norms.

I would like to point out here that I nearly missed a pattern in the data, when I departed from the sentence by sentence method of mutual reanalysis. By taking (10) through (19) out of context and asking only for grammaticality judgments on word insertion, I was making the error of interpreting the meanings of her answers in terms of the TL and not H's IL. Through my preconceptions as a native speaker, I missed completely the fact that she was not using *that* as a relative marker at all. If H had not pointed out the fact that context is essential to her decision to use *which*, *that*, etc., this paper's conclusion would have been false.

That as a complementizer seems to function completely within the norms of the TL throughout the data. *Which*, on the other hand is not used as a complementizer in H's IL data, nor in her speech. The following is a list of sentences where *which* would be a grammatical option as a complementizer:

(20)

IL1 The weather is fine and I sit here in my bikini at the pool and for tan. *So did I yesterday.*

IL2 The weather is fine so I sit here in my bikini at the pool and wait for my suntan—*so I did yesterday.*

(21)

IL1 Oh, now the old ladies (and men) start with gym at the pool —*well it will be good for them.*

IL2 Oh, now the old ladies (and men) start with a gym at the pool —*well, it will be good for them.*

(22)
IL1 *So the have 'dance-tea' here and so on*, see a.m. bingonights etc.
IL2 *That is why they have 5 o'clock tea with dance* and the already mentioned bingo nights and who knows what else?

(23)
IL1 *So I spent time inside.*
IL2 *That is why I spent time inside.*

(24)
IL1 *You would like it*, I saw lots of sheeps, but no shephard.
IL2 *You would like it too*: I saw lots of sheeps, but no shephard.

(25)
IL1 And during thinking of you I fell in sleep—*I hope you didn't.*
IL2 While thinking of you I fell asleep—*hope you did not.*

(26)
IL1 I blow my nose and snuff, *you will like it.*
IL2 I blow my nose and sniffle—*you will like it tomorrow.*

When asked what complementizer she would choose, given the choices *that* or *which*, to introduce the underlined clause, these were her choices: *That* is used in (20) *that's what I did yesterday*, (22) *that is why*, (23) *that is why*, and *what* is used in (21) *what might be good for them*, (24) *...what you would like*, (25) *what I hope you didn't*, (26) *what you will like.*

She explains that *that's what/why* is a phrase, and sounds better than *which is what/why*. During the interview, H used the word *what* as a complementizer. It does not appear in the data, but is a feature of her speech. The *what* complementizer carries the same meaning as the TL complementizer *which*, and seems to have replaced it. *Which* seems to be the main target of H's avoidance strategies in relative clauses. She has no trouble producing clauses introduced by *who*. *Who* appears in her IL1 and IL2 and does not seem the target of avoidance. *That* is no longer a relative marker in her IL, leaving *which* as the only logical target for avoidance.

Special Cases

The relative clauses in (6), (7), and (8) still require explanation. Why does she produce these three relative clauses, when she successfully avoids such constructions elsewhere? We must assume that in these cases the avoidance strategy fails for some reasons, making these special cases.

In sentence (6), H uses strategy *R-1* in her IL1 data in response to the required relative clause. She explains her IL2 correction by saying that the IL1 sentence does not convey her intended sarcastic meaning, (instead, it indicates to her that I actually love bingo nights). She gives the reason for this as "there needs to be an extra connection in there." Assuming that her response in IL2 to the required relative clauses would be the last resort attachment strategy *A*, something like *You know they have bingo nights here too, you love them so much* would have been produced, which would not have conveyed the intended meaning, either. Since a relative clause is required by the context, and since that clause is not reducible, she has no other choice than to produce a relative clause.

In sentence (7), she uses strategy *R-1* as well in IL1. In IL2 she has learned the adjective *touristy*, which leaves the clause *I absolutely do not like (them)* attached to the end of the main clause, as if it were strategy *A*. She explains that for her IL2 this sentence does not convey her intended meaning, since it leaves open the possible interpretation that what she doesn't like is the fact that it is a touristy place, when she means she doesn't like this type of place. Once again there is an extra connection missing. Since a relative clause is once again required by the context, and since that clause is not reducible, she must produce a relative clause.

In both cases she produces relative clauses introduced by *the one,* the "extra connection," which refers to *nights* in (6) and *place* in (7), and is very specific in pointing out the referent. It seems to function the same as it does in the TL, except that there is no singular/plural distinction, and it may be an unanalyzed chunk.

The one is probably not a relative marker in IL2, since it may be followed by *which*. It may also be replaced by *which*, but H would not use *which* by itself here. *Which* is always deletable, and this deletion would return us to the original problem of inadequately conveyed meaning. *The one which* could introduce these clauses, but she warns me that this is a construction with a very restricted usage, carrying a sense of pointing out one from a group, and also implies previous mention of the antecedent in the context.

Sentence (8) seems to be a special case as well. H explains that she definitely intended to form a separate sentence beginning with *which* in the IL2, because the preceding sentence containing the antecedent was already too long. She used *which* to introduce the new sentence because it is more clearly in reference to *National Race*, which she felt was a vague term and wanted to clarify. *That means* did not refer clearly enough to *Race*, and she is not sure why she used it in IL1.

In other words, she used strategy *A*, producing an independent clause in IL1. *That* may have still been used as a relative marker in IL1, but since she clearly does not use it in that function in IL2, she was compelled to correct this error, using the IL2 relative marker *which*. She could not have used *the one* here, since that would

have indicated *this race*, as opposed to *the other races*. She did offer the option of starting the sentence with *It means...*, which would have been more in keeping with her strategy of avoidance.

Conclusions

H seems to be avoiding the use of the relative marker *which*. Because this pronoun has taken over the functions of the relative marker *that*, this avoidance strategy wipes out almost all relative clauses in her IL2. If I am right, then IL3 might well have no restrictive relative clauses at all, except for the rare special case, which may become even more rare as H's strategies become more efficient. The interesting thing to note is how little all of this affects her comprehensibility, a fact which will hinder any motivation to reanalyze this structure.

Not everything in the self analysis/mutual reanalysis method is on the pro side of the tally. Some of the cons are potentially major obstacles. After a long period of time (four years in this case), some amount of the subject's original intentions will inevitably be forgotten. While this could, for the most part, be factored out by having the subject point out lapses in memory where they occur, there will always be some unnoticed loss of information.

Another con is that this method requires perfect candidness on the part of the subject, a factor which cannot be controlled. While that was not a major factor for this paper, since the subject is a longtime friend and was not concerned whether her answers would conform to TL norms, it is quite conceivable that in a free flow analysis like this a subject would give false information when unsure whether his IL match TL rules. Related to this is the fact that the IL2 data might be considered by some to be elicited data. Spontaneous data is usually more revealing than elicited data, due to the fact that there is often some amount of overcorrection and avoidance of certain constructions when subjects are aware that their language is being scrutinized.

This aside, there is one factor in this data which I feel is very important and needs to be addressed. That is the role of the mother tongue in the analysis of ILs and the usefulness of translations. For an upper level learner, translating an IL utterance into the mother tongue is no longer a simple matter. At an earlier stage, the IL may be heavily reliant on the mother tongue, but advanced ILs are independent systems of expression in my opinion. H was already "thinking in English" (to use her own expression) in 1987, and the IL2 corrections were much easier for her than translation into German. She can translate a given utterance to provide the intended meaning, or she can transliterate to give the intended structure, but she cannot do both. Her translations from IL to mother tongue are,

while grammatical, not good German; they do not reflect her natural way of expressing herself in German. She would use different sentence structures and idioms when writing to a native German.

In other words, for the advanced L2 learner, the IL and the mother tongue are two independent systems of expression, and should only be referred back to themselves if what we want is a true sense of what is being said, because meanings and intentions become English or German. It is mainly for this reason that I have not relied on translations and authoritative reconstructions in this paper.

Acknowledgement

Special thanks goes to Usha Lakshmanan, whose guidance was instrumental in forming the original paper, and whose continued feedback helped in writing this revision. All errors, of course, are mine. This paper is a revised version of a term paper originally written in the Summer of 1991 for LING 456, *Contrastive and Error Analysis*, while I was an undergraduate.

References

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Selinker, L. (1991). *Rediscovering interlanguage.* London: Longman.

Selinker, L. & Lakshmanan, U. (In press). Language transfer and fossilization: The multiple effects principle. In S. Gass & L. Selinker, (eds.), *Language transfer in language learning.* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems.* The Hague: Mouton.